

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. New claims 24-26 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-16 and 24-26 are pending.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,309,563 issued to Farrand, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,053 issued to Nouri, et al. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended.

Claim 1, as amended, recites the following:

receiving control operations from a source external to a client device;
determining a current operating state of the client device;
determining whether execution of the received control operations are permitted while the client device is in the current operation state; and
executing the received control operations if the execution has been determined to be permitted.

Farrand discloses a method for transferring messages from a network operating system to a system manager, and Nouri discloses a system for resetting a server. Neither Farrand nor Nouri discloses determining whether execution of control operations received from a source external to the client device are permitted while the client device is in the current operation state, and executing the received control operations if permitted.

The Final Office Action stated that Nouri at col. 6, lines 2-12 discloses conditionally executing the control operations if execution of the control operations is permitted while the client device is in the determined current state. However, the cited text in Nouri only discloses a self-contained microcontroller network that continuously monitors and manages the physical environment of the machine, regardless of the operational status of the server. The cited text in Nouri does not disclose determining whether execution of control operations received from a source external to the client device are permitted while the client device is in the current

operation state, and executing the received control operations if permitted. These features are recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Farrand and Nouri.

Claims 2-7 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-7 are patentable over Farrand and Nouri for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 8, as amended, recites the following:

a first electronic component;
a bus;
a sensor coupled to said bus and said first electronic component to sense events in said first electronic component; and
a second electronic component coupled to said bus to conditionally cause said first electronic component to perform a plurality of functions through said sensor, via said bus, responsive to control operations from a source external to the apparatus.

Farrand discloses a method for transferring messages from a network operating system to a system manager, and Nouri discloses a system for resetting a server. Neither Farrand nor Nouri discloses a sensor coupled to the bus and the first electronic component to sense events in the first electronic component. The Final Office Action stated that Nouri at col. 22, lines 32-65 discloses a sensor coupled to the bus and the first electronic component. However, the only mention of “sensor” in the cited text of Nouri is at line 35, where the text states that an exemplary message from the microcontroller network table may include the text “temperature sensor exceeds threshold.” The cited text in Nouri does not disclose a sensor coupled to a bus and a first electronic component to sense events in the first electronic component, as recited in claim 8.

Furthermore, neither Farrand nor Nouri discloses a second electronic component coupled to the bus to conditionally cause the first electronic component to perform a plurality of

functions through the sensor, via the bus, responsive to control operations from a source external to the apparatus. The Final Office Action stated that Nouri at col. 12, lines 50-62 discloses a second electronic component coupled to the bus to conditionally cause the first electronic component to perform a plurality of functions through the sensor, via the bus, responsive to externally provided control operations. However, the cited text of Nouri merely discloses that the microcontroller network 102 can perform various system administration tasks, such as monitoring the signals that come from server control switches, temperature sensors, and client computers. The cited text in Nouri does not disclose a second electronic component causing a first electronic component to perform functions conditionally, through the sensor and via the bus, in response to control operations from a source external to the apparatus. These features are recited in claim 8. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over Farrand and Nouri.

Claims 9-16 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 9-16 are patentable over Farrand and Nouri for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 24 recites the following:

a proxy to translate command data received from an application external to a client device to client-based hardware control data and to transmit the control data to the client device; and
client hardware within the client device to parse the control data from the proxy and to execute control operations corresponding to the control data if the control operations are permitted in the client device's current operating state.

As discussed above, Farrand discloses a method for transferring messages from a network operating system to a system manager, and Nouri discloses a system for resetting a server. Neither Farrand nor Nouri discloses a proxy to translate command data received from an

application external to a client device to client-based hardware control data and client hardware within the client device to parse the control data from the proxy and to execute control operations if the control operations are permitted in the client device's current operating state. These features are recited in claim 24. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 24 is patentable over Farrand and Nouri.

Claims 25-26 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 25-26 are patentable over Farrand and Nouri for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicants submit that claims 1-16 and 24-26 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 4/10/03

Lisa Tom
Lisa Tom
Reg. No. 52,291

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200